

plaintiffs to request, and for courts to grant, jurisdictional discovery *in the alternative* to denying a defendant's motion to dismiss. *See, e.g., Royal Ten Cate USA, Inc. v. TTAH Tr. Co. Ltd.*, No. A-11-CA-1057 LY, 2012 WL 2376282 (W.D. Tex. June 22, 2012); *Maverick Whiskey, LLC v. Brewery on Half Moon Bay, Inc.*, No. SA-19-CV-00136-JKP, 2020 WL 110753 (W.D. Tex. Jan. 9, 2020).

Here, Plaintiffs have alleged sufficient facts for the Court to exercise personal jurisdiction over the EV Defendants. *See generally*, Plaintiffs' Third Amended Complaint, Dkt. 23 at pp. 7-13. The only evidence the EV Defendants submit in support of their Motion to Dismiss—a single, self-serving affidavit – is contradicted in multiple instances by public record. *Compare* Dkt. 27-1 at 18 *with* Dkt. 29-2 at 4-10; *compare* Dkt. 27-1 at 17 *with* Dkt. 23 at ¶ 60. In their Reply (Dkt. 30), the EV Defendants fail to address any of these contradictions which discredit their threadbare evidence. Moreover, the EV Defendants failed to timely file their Reply, which permits this Court to disregard it in its entirety.

In the event the Court does not agree that Plaintiffs have alleged sufficient evidence to support the exercise of personal jurisdiction over the EV Defendants, Plaintiffs have alternatively moved this Court to permit jurisdictional discovery to resolve any issue of fact. Dkt. 28. If the Court denies the Motion to Dismiss, then Plaintiffs' Motion for Discovery will be rendered moot. But if the “district court makes factual determinations decisive of a motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction, it **must** give plaintiffs an opportunity for discovery and a hearing that is appropriate to the nature of the motion to dismiss.” *McAllister v. FDIC*, 87 F.3d 762, 766 (5th Cir. 1996).

II. Defendants Do Not Contest That Plaintiffs Have Met Their Burden.

Defendants do not contest that Plaintiffs have met their burden demonstrating a need for jurisdictional discovery if the Court does not deny the Motion to Dismiss. It appears Defendants'

sole argument in opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Discovery is that because Plaintiffs did not agree to conduct such discovery before the Court ruled on the Motion to Dismiss, Plaintiffs are no longer entitled to their requested relief. *See* Dkt. 30 at 11. Defendants' argument misses the mark entirely, as it fundamentally disregards the concept of requesting relief in the alternative. Jurisdictional discovery only becomes proper if a court finds that there are fact issues. *Oppenheimer Fund, Inc. v. Sanders*, 437 U.S. 340, 351 n.13 (1978) ("Where issues arise as to jurisdiction or venue, discovery is available to ascertain facts bearing on such issues."). It would be a considerable waste of resources for the Parties to engage in protracted discovery over jurisdictional issues if this Court were to simply deny the Motion to Dismiss. It is of no moment, then, that the Plaintiffs did not agree to the relief they requested in the alternative before the Court's ruling on the underlying Motion to Dismiss.

III. Conclusion.

If the Court finds that issues of fact remain related to personal jurisdiction over the EV Defendants, Plaintiffs have shown that they are entitled to conduct jurisdictional discovery.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Caitlin Boehne

Caitlin Boehne
Texas Bar No. 24075815
cboehne@kaplanlawatx.com
Ryan Estes
Texas Bar No. 24120586
restes@kaplanlawatx.com
Austin Kaplan
State Bar No. 24072176
akaplan@kaplanlawatx.com

KAPLAN LAW FIRM
2901 Bee Cave Road, Suite G
Austin, Texas 78746
Tel.: (512) 814-7348
Fax: (512) 692-2788

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Putative Class Members

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on February 15, 2024, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to all attorneys of record.

/s/ Caitlin Boehne